



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/644,468

08/20/2003

Eric S. Barnes

A3175-US-NP

5956

75931 7590 12/17/2009

BASCH & NICKERSON LLP
1777 PENFIELD ROAD
PENFIELD, NY 14526

EXAMINER

KASSA, HILINA S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/17/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dmasters@bnpatentlaw.com
dneels@bnpatentlaw.com
mnickerson@bnpatentlaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/644,468	Applicant(s) BARNES ET AL.	
	Examiner HILINA S. KASSA	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 8-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 8-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment submitted on 08/13/2009 has been acknowledged.
Claims 1-2 and 8-99 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 08/13/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(1) argument 1:

Applicants argue that Brintzenhofe et al. and McBrearty et al. fails to teach “obtaining a list of document components associated with an interpreted page cacheable reusable, the list of document components including cacheable reusable document components and non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page; and/or identifying the cacheable reusable document components included in the obtained list of documents components associated the interpreted page”

With respect to Applicant's argument, “obtaining a list of document components associated with an interpreted page cacheable reusable, the list of document components including cacheable reusable document components and non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page; and/or identifying the cacheable reusable document

components included in the obtained list of documents components associated the interpreted page”, but Brintzenhofe et al. in **paragraph [0086], lines 1-6; note that a composite document with different types of components is discloses see also figure 6**, the list, associated with an interpreted page cacheable reusable, of document components including cacheable reusable document components. Also, in **paragraph [0086], lines 3-9; note that the cacheable reusable document is identified as the file**, identifying the cacheable reusable document components included in the obtained list of documents components associated the interpreted page. And McBrearty et al. teaches in **figure 5, column 9, lines 28-34; note that a web page is requested or obtained from a server and a check is made to determine if non cached components are present**, obtaining a list of document components and non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page. The rejection of this limitation is based on a combination of the two references and it is not necessary for one reference to teach the whole paragraph. Thus, the argument is not persuasive. Same argument is applied to rejection of claim 31 on page 13 of Applicant’s remarks.

(2) argument 2:

Applicants argue that Gauthier and McBrearty et al. fails to disclose assessing the rendered page for the possibility of having an underlay-overlay pair.

With respect to Applicant's argument, "assessing the rendered page for the possibility of having an underlay-overlay pair", McBrearty et al. in **figure 5, column 9, lines 28-34; note that a web page is requested or obtained from a server and a check is made to determine if non cached components are present, per specification underlay-overlay implies cached and non-cached components, abstract.** The interpretation of McBrearty is taken under consideration based on the defined concept of the claim in the specification. Thus, the stated argument is not persuasive.

(3) argument 3:

Applicant's argue that Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al., Freund fails to disclose a page description language interpreter that combines some of the reusable document components into composites of reusable document components and combines some of the reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of the reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays.

With respect to Applicant's argument, Brintzenhofe et al. disclose said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components **paragraph [0150], lines 1-13; note that it is disclosed how contents**

Art Unit: 2625

may be added to a composition and how each tree or component is changed accordingly. In figure 19, it is shown that the content m design and media trees before combining and after combining; and said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays paragraph [0151], lines 1-11; note that it is disclosed that the components are combined with respect to the relative position i.e. empty text region. Also, Freund teaches said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays column 2, lines 32-44; note that a visual characteristics of the displayed link status indicator indicates whether or not the document represented by the Internet link is stored in the cache. If a user selects a link status indicator, the system and method will fetch the document associated with the corresponding Internet link and store it in the cache without displaying the document to the user. Per specification underlay-overlay implies cached and non-cached components, abstract. Thus, the stated argument is not persuasive.

(4) argument 4:

Applicants argue that Brintzenhofe et al. fails to disclose combining some of the reusable document components into composites of reusable document components and combining some the reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of the reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays.

With respect to Applicant's argument, Brintzenhofe et al. disclose some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components **paragraph [0150], lines 1-13; note that it is disclosed how contents may be added to a composition and how each tree or component is changed accordingly. In figure 19, it is shown that the content m design and media trees before combining and after combining;** and combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays **paragraph [0151], lines 1-11; note that it is disclosed that the components are combined with respect to the relative position i.e. empty text region. Per specification underlay-overlay implies cached and non-cached components, abstract.** Thus, the stated argument is not persuasive.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Art Unit: 2625

In claim 2, the claim is implied as an amended claim, there is no such amendment to the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brintzenhofe et al. (US Publication Number 2005/0223320 A1) in view of McBrearty et al. (US Patent Number 6,744,452 B1).

(1) regarding claim 1:

As shown in figures 4A-8, Brintzenhofe et al. disclose, a method for creating reusable composite components from interpreted pages of a document to be rendered during dynamic document construction, each interpreted page having cacheable reusable document components and *non-cached document components*, **(paragraph [0011], lines 4-11; note that automatic integration, composition and layout of content from multiple sources into intelligent dynamic document templates)** comprising:

Art Unit: 2625

obtaining a list of document components associated with an interpreted page cacheable reusable, the list of document components including cacheable reusable document components and *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page* (**paragraph [0086], lines 1-6; note that a composite document with different types of components is disclosed see also figure 6**);

identifying the cacheable reusable document components included in the obtained list of documents components associated with the interpreted page (**paragraph [0086], lines 3-9; note that the cacheable reusable document is identified as the file**);

caching each identified cacheable reusable document components rendered to each identified cacheable reusable document component's respective bounding box dimensions (**130, figure 4A, paragraph [0100], lines 1-6; note that within the component there are subcomponents which also get rendered to fit content to layout as explained in paragraph [0111], lines 7-11**); and

caching a composite combination of a set of identified cacheable reusable document components rendered, relative to each identified cacheable reusable document component in the composite combination, in a bounding box of sufficient size to adequately contain the composite combination (**paragraph [0125], lines 1-8; note that the brochure composition has been rendered to media as a layout referring to figures 10-12 for the composition**);

Brintzenhofe et al. disclose most of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching obtaining a list of document components from said page and *identifying any non-cached components*.

However, McBrearty et al discloses obtaining a list of document components from said page and *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page* (**figure 5, column 9, lines 28-34; note that a web page is requested or obtained from a server and a check is made to determine if non cached components are present**).

Brintzenhofe et al. and McBrearty et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to obtain a list of document components from said page and *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page*. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been so that it would to efficiently improve a method for identifying cached web pages to a user (column 5, lines 4-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brintzenhofe et al. with McBrearty et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim1.

(2) regarding claim 30:

Brintzenhofe et al. disclosed the method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising: caching, to form a composite reusable underlay, a combination of identified cacheable reusable document components rendered (**paragraph [0133], lines 1-24; note that the design composition of the overall**

Art Unit: 2625

combination for figure 9 is thoroughly described forming a reusable underlay), relative to each identified cacheable reusable document component in the combination, to a full page size (**paragraph [0134], lines 1-8; note that the brochure composition gets rendered to full page size as also shown in figure 9 and it is also explained in paragraph [0135]**).

(3) regarding claim 31:

Brintzenhofe et al. disclosed a method for creating reusable composite components from interpreted pages of a document to be rendered during dynamic document construction, each interpreted page having cacheable reusable document components and *non- cached components* (**paragraph [0011], lines 4-11; note that automatic integration, composition and layout of content from multiple sources into intelligent dynamic document templates**), comprising:

obtaining a list of document components associated with an interpreted page cacheable reusable, the list of document components including cacheable reusable document components and *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page* (**paragraph [0086], lines 1-6; note that a composite document with different types of components is discloses see also figure 6**);

identifying the cacheable reusable document components included in the obtained list of documents components associated with the interpreted page

Art Unit: 2625

(paragraph [0086], lines 3-9; note that the cacheable reusable document is identified as the file); and

 caching, to form a composite reusable underlay, a combination of identified cacheable reusable document components rendered **(paragraph [0125], lines 1-8; note that the brochure composition has been rendered to media as a layout referring to figures 10-12 for the composition)**, relative to each identified cacheable reusable document component in the combination, to a full page size **(paragraph [0134], lines 1-8; note that the brochure composition gets rendered to full page size as also shown in figure 9 and it is also explained in paragraph [0135])**.

 Brintzenhofe et al. disclose most of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page*.

 However, McBrearty et al discloses *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page* **(figure 5, column 9, lines 28-34; note that a web page is requested or obtained from a server and a check is made to determine if non cached components are present)**.

 Brintzenhofe et al. and McBrearty et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to have *non-cached document components associated with the interpreted page*. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been so that it would to efficiently improve a method for

Art Unit: 2625

identifying cached web pages to a user (column 5, lines 4-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brintzenhofe et al. with McBrearty et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 31.

(4) regarding claim 32:

Brintzenhofe et al. disclosed the method as claimed in claim 31, further comprising: caching each identified cacheable reusable document component rendered to each identified cacheable reusable document component's respective bounding box dimensions (**paragraph [0134], lines 1-8; note that the brochure composition gets rendered to full page size as also shown in figure 9 and it is also explained in paragraph [0135]).**

(5) regarding claim 33:

Brintzenhofe et al. disclosed the method as claimed in claim 31, further comprising: caching a composite combination of a set of identified cacheable reusable document components rendered (**130, figure 4A, paragraph [0100], lines 1-6; note that within the component there are subcomponents which also get rendered to fit content to layout as explained in paragraph [0111], lines 7-11**), relative to each identified cacheable reusable document component in the composite combination, in a bounding box of sufficient size to adequately contain the composite combination (**paragraph [0125], lines 1-8; note that the brochure composition has been rendered to media as a layout referring to figures 10-12 for the composition**).

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier (US Publication Number 2004/0141197 A1) in view of McBrearty et al. (US Patent Number 6,744,452 B1).

(1) regarding claim 2:

Gauthier discloses a method for rendering pages having a combination of reusable components and non-cached components (**paragraph [0009]; lines 1-6; note that a variable data which enables the template and graphic state associated with multiple items of variable data from a database or merge file**), comprising:

searching a cache of reusable underlays for underlays having the reusable document components needed by the page (**paragraph [0009], lines 7-12; note that the once the variable data is stored the graphics states can be repeatedly applied to the items of variable data from multiple variable data bitmaps**);

if the correct reusable underlay is not found in cache then generating a composite reusable underlay from the reusable document components of said page and caching said RUL rendered to full page size (**paragraph [0046], lines 11-13; note that if the attributes of the current graphics state differs from the attributes of previously reserved graphics, the control task generates another font cache**);

Art Unit: 2625

creating a full page size overlay from the non-cached components that is retained until it is mated with the cached reusable underlay (**paragraph [0047], lines 1-5; note that once the template is complete, it incorporates all of the static text and graphic data that is to appear on the printed document**);

if the correct underlay is found in cache then retrieving the reusable underlay; and (**paragraph [0049], lines 7-13; note that the merger task accesses the merge file to retrieve the name of the template for the page and then retrieves the names of the data fields and reserved graphic states which are associated with the selected template from the merge file**)

rendering, along with the overlay, the page therefrom (**paragraph [0050], lines 1-5; note that the name corresponding to the first graphics state on the page, the merge accesses the merge file**).

Gauthier disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for assessing said rendered page for the possibility of having an underlay-overlay pair.

However, McBrearty et al. disclose assessing said rendered page for the possibility of having an underlay-overlay pair (**figure 5, column 9, lines 28-34; note that a web page is requested or obtained from a server and a check is made to determine if non cached components are present, per specification underlay-overlay implies cached and non-cached components, abs.**).

Gauthier and McBrearty et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to assess said rendered page for the possibility of having an underlay-overlay pair. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been so that it would to efficiently improve a method for identifying cached web pages to a user (column 5, lines 4-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brintzenhofe et al. with McBrearty et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

7. Claims 8-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier (US Publication Number 2004/0141197 A1) and of Brintzenhofe et al. (US Publication Number 2005/0223320 A1), further in view of Freund (US Patent Number 5,870,769).

(1) regarding claim 8:

Gauthier discloses an apparatus for processing documents each represented by a document description encoded in a page description language supportive of reusable data (**paragraph [0009], lines 1-8; note that a method for utilizing variable data with a page description language**), comprising:

a page description language interpreter that receives the document description (**paragraph [0023], lines 1-8; note that an image containing text and graphics data is created a workstation**) an imager (**12, figure 1**),

Art Unit: 2625

communicating with the interpreter (**paragraph [0024], lines 1-3; note that the generated file gets transferred to the printer**), that creates image representations of received document components (**paragraph [0024], lines 3-4; note that the postscript interpreter creates a page map of the image**); and

a reusable document component repository that stores image representations derived from a plurality of processed documents (**28, figure 1; paragraph [0047], lines 1-6; note that the template gets stored**), the reusable document component repository communicating with the interpreter and the imager to supply those ones of the image representations corresponding to selected document components of the processed documents (**paragraph [0048], lines 1-10; note that figure 1 shows the template storage 28 in communication with the image supplier 10**) and to receive selected image representations created by the imager during the processing of documents (**paragraph [0054], lines 1-9; note that a bit map gets generated for each variable data area and merged with the template, the page map is output for printing as shown at 29**).

Gauthier discloses all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components; and said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the

Art Unit: 2625

relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays.

However, Brintzenhofe et al. disclose said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components (**paragraph [0150], lines 1-13; note that it is disclosed how contents may be added to a composition and how each tree or component is changed accordingly. In figure 19, it is shown that the content m design and media trees before combining and after combining**); and said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays (**paragraph [0151], lines 1-11; note that it is disclosed that the components are combined with respect to the relative position i.e. empty text region**).

Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components; and said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays. The

Art Unit: 2625

suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently utilize document combination and to have a system that adapts the content to be able to fit a variety of media based upon changes to either the content or to the design (paragraph [0010], lines 1-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. disclose most of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays.

However, Freund teaches said page description language interpreter combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays (**column 2, lines 32-44; note that a visual characteristics of the displayed link status indicator indicates whether or not the document represented by the Internet link is stored in the cache. If a user selects a link status indicator, the system and method will fetch the document associated with the corresponding Internet link and store it in the cache without displaying the document to the user**).

Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. and Freund are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art said page description language interpreter combining some of said

Art Unit: 2625

reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently utilize document combination and to have a system that adapts the content to be able to fit a variety of media based upon changes to either the content or to the design (paragraph [0010], lines 1-4, Brintzenhofe) and to allow a user to fetch a document and store it in the cache while the user is viewing another document (column 2, lines 42-44, Freund). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

(2) regarding claim 9:

Gauthier further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a graphical user interface through which an associated user manages the reusable document component repository, the managing including selectively adjusting a repository storage size and selectively deleting image representations (**paragraph [0023], lines 1-5; note that the work station has display unit which displays the image**).

(3) regarding claim 10:

Gauthier further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a compressor that receives and compresses image representations created by the imager (**paragraph [0023], lines 1-8; note that the workstation 10 creates the image then the application program generates a specification of the image in PostScript**), and communicates the compressed image representations to the reusable document component repository (**paragraph [0024], lines 1-4; note that the PostScript interpreter is executed to generate a page map of the image**).

(4) regarding claim 11:

Gauthier further discloses the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 10, wherein the compressor is integrated into the imager (**paragraph [0024], lines 6-9; note that the postscript interpreter program gets initiated by the printer**).

(5) regarding claim 12:

Gauthier further discloses the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a random access memory cache communicating with the interpreter and the reusable document component repository (**28, figure 1, paragraph [0049], lines 7-9; note that the template file has been stored prior so that the merge task begins by accessing the file to retrieve the names of the template for the page**), the random access memory storing at least one

Art Unit: 2625

most recently used image representation retrieved by the interpreter (**paragraph [0049], lines 9-10; note that the specified template gets retrieved**).

(6) regarding claim 13:

Gauthier further discloses the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a repository index that indexes image representations stored in the reusable document component repository, the repository index communicating with the interpreter to identify images to be retrieved (**paragraph [0049], lines 2-4; note that the database is considered as the index repository**).

(7) regarding claim 14:

Gauthier further discloses the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 13, further comprising a ping path between the interpreter and the reusable document component repository by which the interpreter pings the reusable document component repository responsive to the repository index indicating that a selected image representation is contained in the reusable document component repository (**paragraph [0051], lines 1-5; note that the merge task reads the data corresponding to the designated field name and it retrieves the graphics state**), the pinging directing the reusable document component repository not to delete of the selected image representation (**paragraph [0051], lines 5-9**).

(8) regarding claim 15:

Gauthier further discloses the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 14, wherein the repository index is integrated into the page description language interpreter (**paragraph [0024], lines 3-4; note that the postscript interpreter creates a page map of the image**)

(9) regarding claim 16:

Gauthier further disclose the apparatus for processing documents as in claim 8, further comprising a printing station that includes the page description language interpreter (**paragraph [0023], lines 1-8; note that an image containing text and graphics data is created a workstation**), the imager (**12, figure 1**), and the reusable document component repository; and an electronic network by which the printing station receives documents for processing (**paragraph [0024], lines 3-4; note that the postscript interpreter creates a page map of the image**).

8. Claims 17-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier (US Publication Number 2004/0141197 A1) in view of Brintzenhofe et al. (US Publication Number 2005/0223320 A1).

(10) regarding claim 17:

Gauthier further disclose a document construction method comprising:

receiving a document description including at least one selected reusable document component (**paragraph [0009], lines 1-8; note that a method for utilizing variable data with a page description language**);

querying a reusable document component repository containing stored image representations of reusable document components to locate a selected stored image representation corresponding to the selected reusable document component (**28, figure 1; paragraph [0047], lines 1-6; note that the template gets stored**);

conditional upon the querying,

identifying one of the stored image representations as corresponding to the selected reusable document component and retrieving the selected stored image representation corresponding to the selected reusable document component (**paragraph [0048], lines 1-10; note that figure 1 shows the template storage 28 in communication with the image supplier 10**), or,

not identifying one of the stored image representations as corresponding to the selected reusable document component, generating an image representation for the selected reusable document component, and storing the generated image representation in the reusable document component repository (**paragraph [0046], lines 11-13; note that if the attributes of the current**

Art Unit: 2625

graphics state differs from the attributes of previously reserved graphics, the control task generates another font cache); and

converting the document description to a document image representation, the converting including incorporating the selected or generated image representation corresponding to the selected reusable document into the document image representation (**paragraph [0050], lines 1-5; note that the name corresponding to the first graphics state on the page, the merge accesses the merge file).**

Gauthier disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components and combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays.

However, Brintzenhofe et al. disclose some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components (**paragraph [0150], lines 1-13; note that it is disclosed how contents may be added to a composition and how each tree or component is changed accordingly. In figure 19, it is shown that the content m design and media trees before combining and after combining); and combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays (paragraph**

Art Unit: 2625

[0151], lines 1-11; note that it is disclosed that the components are combined with respect to the relative position i.e. empty text region).

Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art some of said reusable document components into composite of reusable document components and combining some of said reusable document components with respect to the relative positions of said reusable document components into composites of reusable underlays. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently utilize document combination and to have a system that adapts the content to be able to fit a variety of media based upon changes to either the content or to the design (paragraph [0010], lines 1-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brintzenhofe et al. with Gauthier to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

(11) regarding claim 18:

Gauthier further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, wherein the step of storing the generated image representation in the reusable document component repository includes associating a life span parameter with the generated image representation (**paragraph [0028], lines 1-3; note that a new attributed gets defined and placed on the top of the stack i.e. consider as the life-time stack**); and responsive to an expiration of the life

Art Unit: 2625

span parameter, removing the corresponding generated image representation from the reusable document component repository (**paragraph [0028], lines 3-7; note that the old attribute gets deleted**).

(12) regarding claim 19:

Gauthier further disclose the document construction method as in claim 18, wherein the step of associating a life span parameter with the generated rasterized image includes associating one of a temporal life span and an indication of permanence with the generated image representation (**paragraph [0044], lines 1-6**).

(13) regarding claim 20:

Gauthier further disclose the document construction method as in claim 18, wherein the life span parameter is such that the generated image representation remains available in the reusable document component repository for reuse in the construction of subsequent documents (**paragraph [0045], lines 1-10**).

(14) regarding claim 21:

Gauthier further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, responsive to a selected user input, further comprising removing the

Art Unit: 2625

generated image representation from the reusable document component repository (**paragraph [0028], lines 3-7**).

(15) regarding claim 22:

Gauthier further discloses the document construction method as in claim 17, wherein the querying includes tracking previously generated image representations (**paragraph [0031], lines 1-7**); and conditional upon the tracking indicating that a previously generated image representation corresponds to the selected reusable document component, verifying the previously generated image representation currently resides in the reusable document component repository (**paragraph [0032], lines 1-14**).

(16) regarding claim 23:

Gauthier further discloses the document construction method as in claim 22, wherein the querying further includes conditional upon a successful verifying, marking the previously generated image representation to prevent a removing thereof (**paragraph [0049], lines 7-9; note that the template file has been stored prior so that the merge task begins by accessing the file to retrieve the names of the template for the page**).

(17) regarding claim 24:

Gauthier further discloses the document construction method as in claim 17, wherein the storing of the generated image representation in the reusable document component repository includes, prior to the storing, compressing the image (**paragraph [0023], lines 1-8; note that the workstation 10 creates the image then the application program generates a specification of the image in PostScript).**

(18) regarding claim 25:

Gauthier further discloses the document construction method as in claim 17, further comprising storing at least a portion of the reusable document component repository in a random access memory cache (**28, figure 1, paragraph [0049], lines 7-9; note that the template file has been stored prior so that the merge task begins by accessing the file to retrieve the names of the template for the page).**

(19) regarding claim 26:

Gauthier further discloses the document construction method as in claim 17, further comprising storing the reusable document component repository on a permanent storage device; and storing most recently accessed image representations in a random access memory cache (**paragraph [0049], lines 2-10).**

(20) regarding claim 27:

Gauthier further disclose the document construction method as in claim 17, further comprising identifying the selected reusable document component as reusable by detecting a reusable document component hint associated with the reusable document component (**paragraph [0046], lines 7-16; note that the variable data is linked with the cached font so that it identifies if the data is corresponding**).

9. Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier (US Publication Number 2004/0141197 A1), Brintzenhofe et al. (US Publication Number 2005/0223320 A1) and McBrearty et al. (US Patent Number 6,744,452 B1) as applied to claim 17, and further in view of Seseck et al. (US Publication Number 2003/0086098).

(1) regarding claim 28:

Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the document description is encoded in a Variable data Intelligent Postscript Printware language.

Art Unit: 2625

However, Seseck et al. disclose wherein the document description is encoded in a Variable data Intelligent Postscript Printware language (**paragraph 30, lines 1-7**).

Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. and Seseck et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document. Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. and Seseck et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document and printing processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein the document description is encoded in a Variable data Intelligent Postscript Printware language. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been so that it would be efficiently process the variable data to the printer ready format (paragraph [0003], lines 12-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. with Seseck et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 28.

(2) regarding claim 29:

Gauthier and Brintzenhofe et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the document description is encoded in a Personalized Print Markup Language.

However, Seseck et al. disclose wherein the document description is encoded in a Personalized Print Markup Language (**paragraph 19, lines 12-17**).

Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. and Seseck et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document. Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. and Seseck et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. presentation processing of document and printing processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein the document description is encoded in a Personalized Print Markup Language. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been so that it would be efficiently process the variable data to the printer ready format (paragraph [0003], lines 12-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gauthier, Brintzenhofe et al. with Seseck et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 29.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Notredame et al. (US Patent Number 6,049,390) disclose a compressed merging of raster images for high speed digital printing.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

Art Unit: 2625

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Hilina Kassa whose telephone number is (571) 270-1676.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore could be reached at (571) 272- 7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hilina S Kassa/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625
December 04, 2009

/Mark K Zimmerman/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625